

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 440

September 19, 1995, 9:50 a.m.
Page S-13756 Temp. Record

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS/Market Promotion Program Elimination

SUBJECT: Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 1976. Cochran motion to table the Bryan/Bumpers amendment No. 2691.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 58-42

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide \$63.78 billion in new budget authority, 80 percent of which will be for mandatory spending programs, and 63 percent of which will be for food welfare programs.

The Bryan/Bumpers amendment would forbid funding the Market Promotion Program using funds from this Act.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Cochran moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The Market Promotion Program (MPP) is a very small program to boost agricultural exports. It is needed to counter aggressive, massive foreign efforts to export their agricultural products to this country. The MPP has been extremely successful. Agriculture exports this year are expected to reach nearly \$50 billion, resulting in a trade surplus in the industry of \$20 billion. Every billion dollars in exports creates 20,000 jobs. We can put these jobs at risk, or we can compete to keep them.

Some Senators have mentioned that they do not believe that the MPP has been proven to increase exports. However, the Department of Agriculture estimates that each dollar of MPP money results in an increase in agricultural exports of between \$2 and \$7. For particular industries, this promotion has led to tremendous benefits that last for years beyond the initial promotional effort. For example, advertising in Mexico led to a 10-fold increase in the number of American apples bought in that country. Cotton exports have more than doubled around the world due to MPP efforts. Other products that have seen huge increases in foreign sales due to this program include avocados, chicken, beef, broccoli, almonds, asparagus, prunes, citrus, kiwi fruit, canned peaches, canned pears,

(See other side)

YEAS (58)			NAYS (42)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (32 or 59%)	Democrats (26 or 57%)		Republicans (22 or 41%)	Democrats (20 or 43%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Akaka	Abraham	Bingaman		
Bennett	Jeffords	Baucus	Brown	Bradley		
Bond	Kassebaum	Biden	Chafee	Bryan		
Burns	Kempthorne	Boxer	Coats	Bumpers		
Campbell	Lott	Breaux	Coverdell	Byrd		
Cochran	McConnell	Conrad	D'Amato	Dodd		
Cohen	Murkowski	Daschle	DeWine	Feingold		
Craig	Packwood	Dorgan	Dole	Glenn		
Domenici	Pressler	Exon	Faircloth	Hollings		
Frist	Shelby	Feinstein	Grams	Kennedy		
Gorton	Simpson	Ford	Gregg	Kerry		
Gramm	Snowe	Graham	Inhofe	Lautenberg		
Grassley	Specter	Harkin	Kyl	Lieberman		
Hatch	Stevens	Heflin	Lugar	Mikulski		
Hatfield	Thomas	Inouye	Mack	Moynihan		
Helms	Thurmond	Johnston	McCain	Reid		
		Kerrey	Nickles	Robb		
		Kohl	Roth	Rockefeller		
		Leahy	Santorum	Sarbanes		
		Levin	Smith	Wellstone		
		Moseley-Braun	Thompson			
		Murray	Warner			
		Nunn				
		Pell				
		Pryor				
		Simon				

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

pistachios, strawberries, walnuts, table grapes, tomatoes, wine, and raisins.

Many of these products are grown principally on the West Coast and in the South. This fact has led to criticism in the past that the MPP is designed to help these regions, particularly California. Some of the same voices that are very vocal in their criticism of the MPP are more muted when discussing the much more generous export assistance that is given for the crops grown in the Midwest. For our part, we do not criticize that \$2 billion in aid for crops grown mainly in the Midwest, nor do we criticize the \$110 million in this bill for the MPP.

The most frequent charge our colleagues have made against the MPP is that it is corporate welfare for some of the richest companies in America. For instance, they like to mention that McDonald's has received MPP funds for advertising overseas. This claim is a gross distortion of why McDonald's has received MPP funds. The Poultry and Egg Export Council, representing thousands of farmers, gave McDonald's MPP funds to advertise that it was using U.S. chicken and eggs in its products. Without these funds and this advertising, McDonald's in overseas markets would be under no obligation to use U.S. chicken and eggs--they could use inferior, and cheaper, foreign sources. The point is that McDonald's received funds not to benefit it, but to benefit U.S. farm products. The same is true for other promotional funds that have been given to large corporations. These corporations generally buy from thousands of small and medium-sized farms around the country. When helping them helps thousands of farmers, we see no problem with giving them MPP funds. Our colleagues should not let their fear that they may accidentally help out a large corporation stand in their way of helping America's farmers expand their markets around the world.

America's agricultural products are the best in the world bar none. In this area, the United States is very competitive. It will not maintain that dominance if it does nothing as the Europeans and others aggressively promote their farm goods (European subsidies on just the wine that they export to the United States each year exceed the amount the United States spends on the MPP). Our colleagues may favor unilateral trade disarmament, but we do not. We strongly support the MPP, and thus urge our colleagues to table this amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

We have been fighting this battle for many years, along with many groups from across the political spectrum. The Cato Institute, the Progressive Policy Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the National Taxpayers Union, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, Citizens against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, the Concord Coalition Citizens Council, and the Competitive Enterprise Institute all say that the MPP should be eliminated. The General Accounting Office has also weighed in, saying that there is absolutely no evidence that the MPP does any good, and the Congressional Budget Office perennially puts it on its list of programs that should be terminated.

Topping the list for receiving MPP funds in both 1993 and 1994 is Ernest & Julio Gallo. In 1994 it received a \$7.9 million gift from the American taxpayers so it would run ads in foreign countries. This huge, multinational firm did not need \$7.9 million to add to its advertising budget in order to convince it to advertise overseas. Similarly, McDonald's, which has a worldwide advertising budget of nearly \$700 million, had no need for the \$1.6 million in MPP funds it received between 1986 and 1994. These are not the only huge multinational corporations that have received MPP funding--other beneficiaries include Campbell Soups, Seagrams, Hershey, Jim Beam, Ralston Purina, Dole, Pillsbury, Tysons Food, M&M/Mars, and ConAgra. None of these multinational corporations needs MPP payments to convince them to advertise overseas.

We have no doubt, though, that they enjoy receiving payments. We have no doubt, either, that they are pleased that there are many politicians for them to contribute to who share their favorable view of the MPP. The recipients of this corporate welfare and their congressional supporters seem to be the only groups in America defending this program. We have tried many times in the past to eliminate it, but have failed. This year, with the huge change in congressional membership, we are hopeful for a different result. We urge our colleagues to join us in voting to eliminate the MPP.